

# POMERANTZ LLP

Murielle Steven Walsh  
Partner

May 19, 2017

**VIA ECF**

Hon. Naomi Reice Buchwald, U.S.D.J.  
Southern District of New York  
Daniel Patrick Moynihan United States Courthouse  
500 Pearl Street, Courtroom 21A  
New York, NY 10007

RE: *Exley v. MGT Capital Investments, Inc. et al.*, 16-cv-7415 (NRB)

Dear Judge Buchwald:

We write with respect to the parties' stipulated proposed scheduling order, which we submitted to your chambers on April 26, 2017 and which specified the following deadlines:

- June 30, 2017 for the amended complaint
- August 29, 2017 for Defendants' response thereto
- If Defendants move to dismiss:
  - October 27, 2017 for Lead Plaintiff's opposition brief
  - November 30, 2017 for Defendants' reply brief

The parties agreed on these dates in part because the associate at Lead Counsel with primary responsibility for this matter will be observing the month of Ramadan from May 26, 2017 until June 25, 2017, and counsel of record for Defendants has a three-week trial scheduled to begin July 24, 2017.

Subsequently, Lead Counsel received a phone call from your chambers requesting a shortened schedule providing 45 days for the amended complaint, 45 days for Defendants' response, 45 days for Lead Plaintiff's opposition brief, and 21 days for Defendants' reply brief.

Lead Counsel has conferred with Defendants, and the parties are happy to shorten the briefing schedule. However, the reasons for requesting additional time for the amended complaint and for Defendants' response thereto remain. Accordingly, Lead Counsel would like to propose the following schedule:

mjsteven@pomlaw.com

600 Third Avenue, New York, New York 10016 tel: 212.661.1100 www.pomerantzlaw.com

NEW YORK

CHICAGO

LOS ANGELES

PARIS

{00240990;3 }

---

# POMERANTZ LLP

---

Hon. Naomi Reice Buchwald, U.S.D.J.

May 19, 2017

Page 2

- June 30, 2017 for the amended complaint
- August 29, 2017 for Defendants' response thereto
- If Defendants move to dismiss:
  - October 13, 2017 for Lead Plaintiff's opposition brief
  - November 3, 2017 for Defendants' reply brief

Defendants have stated that they have no objection to this proposed schedule but that, to the extent it differs from the schedule requested by the Court, the difference is at Lead Counsel's request.

Respectfully submitted,

*/s/ Murielle J. Steven Walsh*

Murielle J. Steven Walsh

CC: All counsel of record (via ECF)